

### **REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11 and 12 are now present in the application. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claim 12 has been added. Claims 1 and 12 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **Interview With The Examiner**

A telephone interview was conducted with the Examiner in charge of the above-identified application on January 14, 2010. Applicant greatly appreciates the courtesy shown by the Examiner during the interview.

During the interview with the Examiner, Applicant's representative presented arguments and proposed amendments with regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Examiner indicated that if claim 1 is amended to recite the folding feature of the frame, it may overcome the current rejections; however, further search and consideration will be necessary.

In this Reply, claim 1 has been amended to include the folding feature of the frame for the Examiner's further consideration.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanley, U.S. Patent No. 6,733,150 in view of Petell, U.S. Patent No. 6,302,570. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanley in view of Petell, and

further in view of Lee, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0021566. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including “a light-emitting diode module including a plurality of light-emitting diodes arranged as a unitary module; a single-piece, folded frame having a first end and a second end, said plurality of light-emitting diodes being positioned adjacent to said first end for selectively emitting light therefrom, the single-piece frame having a first part and a second part, a plurality of snap-on fasteners being located on each of the first part and the second part, the snap-on fasteners on the first part respectively facing and matching the snap-on fasteners on the second part, thereby fastening the first part to the second part and forming the folded frame, the light-emitting diodes being located in a space of the folded frame between the first part and the second part; and an electronics control part for controlling the light-emitting diodes, the electronics control part including a switch, said switch being displaced towards said second end of said frame relative to the positioning of the light-emitting diodes, wherein the second part of the frame has an opening receiving the electronics control part, wherein the light-emitting diodes are fitted in the frame, side by side, adjacent to each other, said light-emitting diodes being directly operatively connected to the switch through the frame without the use of elongated wires, and wherein the light-emitting diodes and the switch are arranged integrally to the frame.”

Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found in FIGs. 2 and 3 and the corresponding description of the specification (e.g., page 2, lines 28-33) as originally filed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

In particular, the Examiner referred to the headgear 801 of Hanley as the frame. However, as shown in FIG. 8 of Hanley, the headgear 801 is not a folded frame with a plurality of snap-on thereon to fasten a first part of the headgear 801 to a second part of the headgear 801. In addition, the light-emitting diodes 832 of Hanley are located under the rim 810, not in a space of any folded structure. Furthermore, the headgear 801 of Hanley does not have any opening receiving the power supply 850 (referred to by the Examiner as the electronics control part). Therefore, Hanley fails to teach “a single-piece, folded frame having a first end and a second end, said plurality of light-emitting diodes being positioned adjacent to said first end for selectively emitting light therefrom, the single-piece frame having a first part and a second part, a plurality of snap-on fasteners being located on each of the first part and the second part, the snap-on fasteners on the first part respectively facing and matching the snap-on fasteners on the second part, thereby fastening the first part to the second part and forming the folded frame, the light-emitting diodes being located in a space of the folded frame between the first part and the second part” and “wherein the second part of the frame has an opening receiving the electronics control part” as recited in claim 1.

Petell also fails to cure the deficiencies of Hanley. In particular, as shown in FIGs. 2A and 2B of Petell, the housing 210 (referred to by the Examiner as the frame) is not a folded structure, and does not have any snap-on thereon to fasten the upper and lower parts of the housing 210. Instead, Petell uses the screw 235 to fasten the upper and lower parts of the housing 210. Therefore, Petell fails to teach “a single-piece, folded frame having a first end and

a second end, said plurality of light-emitting diodes being positioned adjacent to said first end for selectively emitting light therefrom, the single-piece frame having a first part and a second part, a plurality of snap-on fasteners being located on each of the first part and the second part, the snap-on fasteners on the first part respectively facing and matching the snap-on fasteners on the second part, thereby fastening the first part to the second part and forming the folded frame, the light-emitting diodes being located in a space of the folded frame between the first part and the second part” as recited in claim 1.

With regard to the Examiner’s reliance on Lee, this reference has only been relied on for its teachings against dependent claim 11. This reference also fails to disclose the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, this reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Hanley.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 1 or its dependent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 or its dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

#### **Additional Claim**

Claim 12 has been added for the Examiner’s consideration. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in new independent claim 12 is not

disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner. Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 13-20 are respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Cheng-Kang (Greg) Hsu, Registration No. 61,007 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 25, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant

